arXiv:1405.1522v1 [math.FA] 7 May 2014

A revised pre-order principle and set-valued Ekeland variational principle[1]

Jing-Hui Qiu

School of Mathematical Sciences, Soochow University, Suzhou 215006, P. R. China

Abstract. In my former paper "A pre-order principle and set-valued Ekeland variational principle" (see: arXiv: 1311.4951[math.FA]), we established a general pre-order principle. From the pre-order principle, we deduced most of the known set-valued Ekeland variational principles (denoted by EVPs) and their improvements. But the pre-order principle could not imply Khanh and Quy's EVP in [On generalized Ekeland's variational principle and equivalent formulations for set-valued mappings, J. Glob. Optim., 49 (2011), 381-396], where the perturbation contains a weak τ-function. In this paper, we give a revised version of the pre-order principle. This revised version not only implies the original pre-order principle, but also can be applied to obtain the above Khanh and Quy's EVP. Thus, the revised pre-order principle implies all the known set-valued EVPs in set containing forms (to my knowledge).

Key words: Pre-order Principle, Ekeland variational principle, Set-valued map, Perturbation, Locally convex space, Vector optimization

Mathematics Subject Classifications (2000) 49J53 · 90C48 · 65K10 · 46A03

1. Introduction

In [20], we established a general pre-order principle, which consists of a pre-order set $(X, \preceq)$ and a monotone extended real-valued function η on $(X, \preceq)$. The pre-order principle states that there exists a strong minimal point dominated by any

[1]This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (10871141).
E-mail address: qjhsd@sina.com, jhqiu@suda.edu.cn

given point provided that the monotone function η satisfies three general conditions. The key to the proof of the general pre-order principle is to distinguish two different points by scalarizations. From the pre-order principle we obtained a very general set-valued Ekeland variational principle (briefly, denoted by EVP), which implies most of the known set-valued EVPs and their improvements, for example, Ha's EVP in [7], Qiu's EVP in [17], Bednarczuk and Zagrodny's EVP in [3], Gutiérrez, Jiménez and Novo's EVPs in [6], Tammer and Zălinescu's EVPs in [22], Flores-Bazán, Gutiérrez and Novo's EVPs in [4], Liu and Ng's EVPs in [13], Qiu's EVPs in [18], Khanh and Quy's EVPs in [11] and Bao and Mordukhovich's EVPs in [1, 2]. However, it could not imply Khanh and Quy's EVPs in [10], where the perturbations contain weak τ-functions. The crux of the problem is that weak τ-function $p(x, x')$ may be zero even though $x \neq x'$. This inspired us to find a revised version of the pre-order principle so that it can imply Khanh and Quy's EVPs in [10] as well.

In this paper, we give a revised version of the general pre-order principle. The revised version implies the original pre-order principle in [20] and can be applied to the case that the perturbation contains a weak τ-function. Hence, the revised pre-order principle not only implies all the set-valued EVPs in [20], but also implies Khanh and Quy's EVPs in [10] and their improvements. Thus, the revised pre-order principle implies all the known set-valued EVPs in set containing forms (to my knowledge).

2. A revised pre-order principle

Let X be a nonempty set. As in [4], a binary relation $\preceq$ on X is called a pre-order if it satisfies the transitive property; a quasi order if it satisfies the reflexive and transitive properties; a partial order if it satisfies the antisymmetric, reflexive and transitive properties. Let $(X, \preceq)$ be a pre-order set. An extended real-valued function $\eta : (X, \preceq) \to R \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ is called monotone with respect to $\preceq$ if for any $x_1, x_2 \in X$,

$$x_1 \preceq x_2 \implies \eta(x_1) \leq \eta(x_2).$$

For any given $x_0 \in X$, denote $S(x_0)$ the set $\{x \in X : x \preceq x_0\}$. We give a revised version of [20, Theorem 2.1] as follows.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $(X, \preceq)$ be a pre-order set, $x_0 \in X$ such that $S(x_0) \neq \emptyset$ and $\eta : (X, \preceq) \to R \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ be an extended real-valued function which is monotone with respect to $\preceq$.*

Suppose that the following conditions are satisfied:

(A) $-\infty < \inf\{\eta(x) : x \in S(x_0)\} < +\infty$.

(B) *For any $x \in S(x_0)$ with $-\infty < \eta(x) < +\infty$ and any $z_1, z_2 \in S(x)$ with $z_1 \neq z_2$, one has $\eta(x) > \min\{\eta(z_1), \eta(z_2)\}$.*

(C) *For any sequence $(x_n) \subset S(x_0)$ with $x_n \in S(x_{n-1})$, $\forall n$, such that $\eta(x_n) - \inf\{\eta(x) : x \in S(x_{n-1})\} \to 0 \quad (n \to \infty)$, there exists $u \in X$ such that $u \in S(x_n)$, $\forall n$.*

Then there exists $\hat{x} \in X$ such that

(a) $\hat{x} \in S(x_0)$;

(b) $S(\hat{x}) \subset \{\hat{x}\}$.

Proof. The first half of the proof is similar to that of [20 , Theorem 2.1]. Here, for the sake of completeness, we give the whole process.

For brevity, we denote $\inf\{\eta(x) : x \in S(x_0)\}$ by $\inf \eta \circ S(X_0)$. By (A), we have

$$-\infty < \inf \eta \circ S(x_0) < +\infty. \tag{2.1}$$

So, there exists $x_1 \in S(x_0)$ such that

$$\eta(x_1) < \inf \eta \circ S(x_0) + \frac{1}{2}. \tag{2.2}$$

By the transitive property of $\preceq$, we have

$$S(x_1) \subset S(x_0). \tag{2.3}$$

If $S(x_1) \subset \{x_1\}$, then we may take $\hat{x} := x_1$ and clearly $\hat{x}$ satisfies (a) and (b). If not, by (2.1), (2.2) and (2.3) we conclude that

$$-\infty < \inf \eta \circ S(x_1) < +\infty.$$

So, there exists $x_2 \in S(x_1)$ such that

$$\eta(x_2) < \inf \eta \circ S(x_1) + \frac{1}{2^2}.$$

In general, if $x_{n-1} \in X$ has been chosen, we may choose $x_n \in S(x_{n-1})$ such that

$$\eta(x_n) < \inf \eta \circ S(x_{n-1}) + \frac{1}{2^n}.$$

If there exists n such that $S(x_n) \subset \{x_n\}$, then we may take $\hat{x} := x_n$ and clearly $\hat{x}$ satisfies (a) and (b). If not, we can obtain a sequence $(x_n) \subset S(x_0)$ with $x_n \in S(x_{n-1}),\ \forall n$, such that

$$\eta(x_n) < \inf \eta \circ S(x_{n-1}) + \frac{1}{2^n},\ \forall n. \tag{2.4}$$

Obviously, $\eta(x_n) - \inf \eta \circ S(x_{n-1}) \to 0$ when $n \to \infty$. By (C), there exists $u \in X$ such that

$$u \in S(x_n),\ \ \forall n. \tag{2.5}$$

Obviously, $u \in S(x_0)$, i.e., u satisfies (a).

By (A), $\eta(u) \geq \inf\ \eta \circ S(x_0) > -\infty$. Also, from $u \in S(x_1)$ and (2.2), we have

$$\eta(u) \leq \eta(x_1) < \inf\ \eta \circ S(x_0) + \frac{1}{2} < +\infty.$$

Hence

$$-\infty < \eta(u) < +\infty. \tag{2.6}$$

Now, we assert that $S(u)$ could not contain two different points. If not, there exists $z_1, z_2 \in S(u)$ such that $z_1 \neq z_2$. By (2.6) and (B), we have

$$\eta(u) > \min\{\eta(z_1), \eta(z_2)\}.$$

For definiteness, assume that

$$\eta(u) > \eta(z_1). \tag{2.7}$$

On the other hand, by $u \in S(x_n)$ and $z_1 \in S(u)$, we have

$$z_1 \in S(u) \subset S(x_n),\ \ \forall n. \tag{2.8}$$

By $u \preceq x_n$, (2.4) and (2.8), we have

$$\eta(u) \leq \eta(x_n) < \inf\ \eta \circ S(x_{n-1}) + \frac{1}{2^n} \leq \eta(z_1) + \frac{1}{2^n}.$$

Letting $n \to \infty$, we have $\eta(u) \leq \eta(z_1)$, which contradicts (2.7). Thus, we have shown that $S(u)$ is only empty set or singleton.

If $S(u) = \emptyset$, then put $\hat{x} := u$. Obviously, $\hat{x}$ satisfies (a) and (b).

If $S(u)$ is a singleton $\{v\}$, then we conclude that $S(v) \subset \{v\}$. In fact, if there exists $w \in S(v)\backslash\{v\}$, then $w \neq v$ and $v, w \in S(u)$. This contradicts the conclusion that $S(u)$ could not contain two different points. Also, we remark that

$v \in S(u) \subset S(x_0)$. Thus, $\hat{x} := v$ satisfies (a) and (b). □

Corollary 2.1. (see [20, Theorem 2.1]) *The result of Theorem 2.1 remains true if assumption* (B) *is replaced by the following assumption:*

(B_0) *For any $x \in S(x_0)$ with $-\infty < \eta(x) < +\infty$ and any $x' \in S(x)\backslash\{x\}$, one has $\eta(x) > \eta(x')$.*

Proof. It is sufficient to show that (B_0) $\Rightarrow$ (B). Let $x \in S(x_0)$ with $-\infty < \eta(x) < +\infty$ and let $z_1, z_2 \in S(x)$ with $z_1 \neq z_2$. Obviously, at least one of z_1 and z_2 is not equal to x. For definiteness, we assume that $z_1 \neq x$. Thus, by (B_0) we have $\eta(x) > \eta(z_1)$. Certainly, $\eta(x) > \min\{\eta(z_1), \eta(z_2)\}$ and (B) holds. □

Remark 2.1. From Corollary 2.1, we know that Theorem 2.1 implies [20, Theorem 2.1]. Hence, from Theorem 2.1 we can deduce all the set-valued EVPs in [20]. Furthermore, we shall see that Theorem 2.1 also implies the set-valued EVPs in [10] and their improvements.

3. A general set-valued EVP

Let Y be a real linear space. If A, $B \subset Y$ and $\alpha \in R$, the sets $A + B$ and αA are defined as follows:

$$A + B := \{z \in Y : \exists x \in A, \exists y \in B \text{ such that } z = x + y\},$$

$$\alpha A := \{z \in Y : \exists x \in A \text{ such that } z = \alpha x\}.$$

A nonempty subset D of Y is called a cone if $\alpha D \subset D$ for any $\alpha \geq 0$. And D is called a convex cone if $D + D \subset D$ and $\alpha D \subset D$ for any $\alpha \geq 0$. A convex cone D can specify a quasi order $\leq_D$ on Y as follows:

$$y_1, y_2 \in Y, \quad y_1 \leq_D y_2 \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad y_1 - y_2 \in -D.$$

In this case, D is also called the ordering cone or positive cone. We always assume that D is nontrivial, i.e., $D \neq \{0\}$ and $D \neq Y$. An extended real function $\xi : Y \to R \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ is said to be D-monotone if $\xi(y_1) \leq \xi(y_2)$ whenever $y_1 \leq_D y_2$. For any nonempty subset M of Y, we put $\inf \xi \circ M = \inf\{\xi(y) : y \in M\}$. If $\inf \xi \circ M > -\infty$,

we say that ξ is lower bounded on M. For any given $y \in Y$, sometimes we denote $\xi(y)$ by $\xi \circ y$. A family of set-valued maps $F_\lambda : X \times X \to 2^D \backslash \{\emptyset\},\ \lambda \in \Lambda$, is said to satisfy the "triangle inequality" property (briefly, denoted by property TI, see [4]) if for each $x_i \in X,\ i = 1, 2, 3$, and $\lambda \in \Lambda$ there exist $\mu, \nu \in \Lambda$ such that

$$F_\mu(x_1, x_2) + F_\nu(x_2, x_3) \ \subset\ F_\lambda(x_1, x_3) + D.$$

Let X be a nonempty set and let $f : X \to 2^Y \backslash \{\emptyset\}$ be a set-valued map. For any nonempty set $A \subset X$, we put $f(A) := \cup\{f(x) : x \in A\}$. For any $x_1, x_2 \in X$, define $x_2 \preceq x_1$ iff

$$f(x_1) \subset f(x_2) + F_\lambda(x_2, x_1) + D, \quad \forall \lambda \in \Lambda.$$

Lemma 3.1. (see [20, lemma 3.1]) *"$\preceq$" is a pre-order on X, i.e., it is a binary relation satisfying transitive property.*

Now, we can prove the following theorem, which is indeed a generalization of [20, Theorem 3.1].

Theorem 3.1. *Let X be a nonempty set, Y be a real linear space, $D \subset Y$ be a convex cone specifying a quasi order $\leq_D$ on Y, $f : X \to 2^Y \backslash \{\emptyset\}$ be a set-valued map and $F_\lambda : X \times X \to 2^D \backslash \{\emptyset\},\ \lambda \in \Lambda$, be a family of set-valued maps satisfying the property TI. Let $x_0 \in X$ such that*

$$S(x_0) := \{x \in X :\ f(x_0) \subset f(x) + F_\lambda(x, x_0) + D,\ \forall \lambda \in \Lambda\} \ \neq\ \emptyset.$$

Suppose that there exists a D-monotone extended real-valued function $\xi : Y \to R \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ satisfying the following assumptions:

(D) $-\infty < \inf \xi \circ f(S(x_0)) < +\infty$.

(E) *For any $x \in S(x_0)$ with $-\infty < \inf \xi \circ f(x) < +\infty$ and for any $z_1, z_2 \in S(x)$ with $z_1 \neq z_2$, one has* $\inf \xi \circ f(x) > \min\{\inf \xi \circ f(z_1), \inf \xi \circ f(z_2)\}$.

(F) *For any sequence $(x_n) \subset S(x_0)$ with $x_n \in S(x_{n-1}),\ \forall n$, such that* $\inf \xi \circ f(x_n) - \inf \xi \circ f(S(x_{n-1})) \to 0\ \ (n \to \infty)$, *there exists $u \in X$ such that $u \in S(x_n),\ \forall n$.*

Then there exists $\hat{x} \in X$ such that

(a) $f(x_0) \subset f(\hat{x}) + F_\lambda(\hat{x}, x_0) + D,\ \forall \lambda \in \Lambda$;
(b) $\forall x \in X \backslash \{\hat{x}\}, \exists \lambda \in \Lambda$ *such that* $f(\hat{x}) \not\subset f(x) + F_\lambda(x, \hat{x}) + D$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.1, we can define a pre-order $\preceq$ on X as follows: for any $x_1,\ x_2 \in X$,

$$x_2 \preceq x_1 \quad \text{iff} \quad f(x_1) \subset f(x_2) + F_\lambda(x_2, x_1) + D,\ \forall \lambda \in \Lambda.$$

Thus, $S(x_0) = \{x \in X : x \preceq x_0\}$. Define an extended real-valued function $\eta : (X, \preceq) \to R \cup \{\pm\infty\}$ as follows

$$\eta(x) := \inf \xi \circ f(x), \quad \forall x \in X.$$

Let $x' \preceq x$. Then

$$f(x) \subset f(x') + F_\lambda(x', x) + D, \quad \forall \lambda \in \Lambda.$$

For any $y \in f(x)$, there exists $y' \in f(x'),\ q_\lambda(x', x) \in F_\lambda(x', x),\ d_{\lambda,x',x} \in D$ such that

$$y = y' + q_\lambda(x', x) + d_{\lambda,x',x}.$$

Since

$$y - y' = q_\lambda(x', x) + d_{\lambda,x',x} \in D,\ \text{i.e.,}\ y \geq_D y',$$

we have

$$\xi(y) \geq \xi(y') \geq \inf \xi \circ f(x').$$

As $y \in f(x)$ is arbitrary, we have

$$\inf \xi \circ f(x) \geq \inf \xi \circ f(x'), \quad \text{i.e.,}\ \ \eta(x) \geq \eta(x').$$

Thus, η is monotone with respect to $\preceq$. It is easy to see that assumptions (D), (E) and (F) are exactly assumptions (A), (B) and (C) in Theorem 2.1. Now, applying Theorem 2.1, we know that there exists $\hat{x} \in X$ such that $\hat{x} \in S(x_0)$ and $S(\hat{x}) \subset \{\hat{x}\}$. This means that

$$f(x_0) \subset f(\hat{x}) + F_\lambda(\hat{x}, x_0) + D,\ \forall \lambda \in \Lambda$$

and

$$\forall x \in X \backslash \{\hat{x}\}, \exists \lambda \in \Lambda \text{ such that } f(\hat{x}) \not\subset f(x) + F_\lambda(x, \hat{x}) + D.$$

That is, $\hat{x}$ satisfies (a) and (b). □

For a real linear space Y, denote the algebraic dual of Y by $Y^{\#}$ and denote the positive polar cone of D in $Y^{\#}$ by $D^{+\#}$, i.e., $D^{+\#} = \{l \in Y^{\#} : l(d) \geq 0, \forall d \in D\}$. Particularly, if the ξ in Theorem 3.1 is an element of $D^{+\#}\backslash\{0\}$. then assumptions (D) and (E) become more concise.

Theorem 3.1′. *let X, Y, D, f, F_λ, $\lambda \in \Lambda$, and $x_0 \in X$ be the same as in Theorem 3.1. Suppose that there exists $\xi \in D^{+\#}\backslash\{0\}$ satisfying the following assumptions:*

(D) *ξ is lower bounded on $f(S(x_0))$, i.e., $-\infty < \inf \xi \circ f(S(x_0))$.*

(E) *For any $x \in S(x_0)$ and any $z_1, z_2 \in S(x)$ with $z_1 \neq z_2$, one has $\inf \xi \circ f(x) > \min\{\inf \xi \circ f(z_1), \inf \xi \circ f(z_2)\}$.*

(F) *See Theorem 3.1.*

Then the result of Theorem 3.1 remains true.

Obviously, Theorem 3.1′ here is a generalization of [20, Theorem 3.1′]. Hence, from Theorem 3.1′ we can deduce a number of specific versions of EVP in [20]. Moreover, it is encouraging that Theorem 3.1′ can be applied to the case that the perturbation contains a weak τ-function. From this, we can deduce Khanh and Quy's EVPs in [10] and their generalizations.

4. Set-valued EVPs where perturbations contain p-distance, q-distances and r-distances

In order to derive Khanh and Quy's EVPs in [10], we need recall the definitions of τ-functions and weak τ-functions.

Definition 4.1. (see [10, 12]) Let (X, d) be a metric space. Then a real-valued function $p : X \times X \to [0, +\infty)$ is called a τ-function on X if the following conditions are satisfied:

(τ1) for any $x, y, z \in X$, $p(x, z) \leq p(x, y) + p(y, z)$;

(τ2) if $x \in X$ and a sequence (y_n) with $y_n \to y$ in X and $p(x, y_n) \leq M$ for some $M = M(x) > 0$, then $p(x, y) \leq M$;

(τ3) for any sequence (y_n) in X with $p(y_n, y_m) \to 0$ $(m > n \to \infty)$, if there exists (z_n) in X such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} p(y_n, z_n) = 0$, then $\lim_{n\to\infty} d(y_n, z_n) = 0$;

($\tau 4$) for $x, y, z \in X$, $p(z, x) = 0$ and $p(z, y) = 0$ imply $x = y$.

A real-valued function $p : X \times X \to [0, +\infty)$ is called a weak τ-function if condition ($\tau 2$) is removed. i.e., only conditions ($\tau 1$), ($\tau 3$) and ($\tau 4$) hold.

It is known ([12]) that a w-distance (see [9]) is a τ-function. In [21], we introduced the notions of p-distances and q-distances. Here, we further introduce a more general notion: r-distances. We list these notions as follows.

Definition 4.2. Let X be a separated uniform space. An extended real-valued function $p : X \times X \to [0, +\infty]$ is called a p-distance on X if the following conditions (q1)–(q3) are satisfied:

(q1) for any $x, y, z \in X$, $p(x, z) \leq p(x, y) + p(y, z)$;

(q2) every sequence $(y_n) \subset X$ with $p(y_n, y_m) \to 0$ $(m > n \to \infty)$ is a Cauchy sequence and in the case $p(y_n, y) \to 0$ is equivalent to $y_n \to y$ in X;

(q3) for $x, y, z \in X$, $p(z, x) = 0$ and $p(z, y) = 0$ imply $x = y$.

If condition (q2) is replaced by the following weaker condition

(q2′) every sequence $(y_n) \subset X$ with $p(y_n, y_m) \to 0$ $(m > n \to \infty)$ is a Cauchy sequence and in the case $p(y_n, y) \to 0$ implies $y_n \to y$ in X,

then p is called a q-distance on X.

Moreover, if condition (q2) is replaced by the following further weaker condition

(q2″) every sequence $(y_n) \subset X$ with $p(y_n, y_m) \to 0$ $(m > n \to \infty)$ is a Cauchy sequence,

then p is called an r-distance on X.

Obviously, every weak τ-function is a finite-valued q-distance. Certainly, it is also an r-distance.

Definition 4.3. (see [18, Definition 3.4]) Let X be a topological space and let $S(\cdot) : X \to 2^X \backslash \{\emptyset\}$ be a set-valued map. The set-valued map $S(\cdot)$ is said to be dynamically closed at $x \in X$ if $(x_n) \subset S(x)$, $S(x_{n+1}) \subset S(x_n) \subset S(x)$ for all n and $x_n \to \bar{x}$, then $\bar{x} \in S(x)$. In this case, we also say that $S(x)$ is dynamically closed. Moreover, let X be an uniform space and $x \in X$. Then X is said to be $S(x)$-dynamically complete if every Cauchy sequence $(x_n) \subset S(x)$ such that $S(x_{n+1}) \subset S(x_n) \subset S(x)$ for all n, is convergent in X.

If Y is a separated topological vector space, we denote Y^* the topological dual of Y and denote D^+ the positive polar cone of D in Y^*, i.e., $D^+ := \{l \in Y^* : l(d) \geq 0,\ \forall d \in D\}$. It is possible that $Y^* = \{0\}$, i.e., there is no non-trivial continuous linear functional on Y. However, if Y is a locally convex separated topological vector space (briefly, denoted by a locally convex space), then Y^* is large enough so that Y^* can separate points in Y. for a convex set $H \subset D\backslash\{0\}$, we denote H^{+s} the set $\{l \in Y^* : \inf l \circ H > 0\}$. It is easy to see that $H^{+s} \cap D^+ \neq \emptyset$ iff $0 \notin \mathrm{cl}(H + D)$. Now, we can give our first special set-valued EVP, where the perturbation consists of an r-distance and a convex subset H of the ordering cone D.

Theorem 4.1. *Let $(X,\mathcal{U})$ be a sequentially complete uniform space, Y be a locally convex space quasi ordered by a convex cone D, $H \subset D\backslash\{0\}$ be a convex set, $f : X \to 2^Y\backslash\{\emptyset\}$ be a set-valued map and $p : X \times X \to [0, +\infty)$ be an r-distance. Let $x_0 \in X$ such that $S(x_0) := \{x \in X : f(x_0) \subset f(x) + p(x_0, x)H + D\} \neq \emptyset$ and for any $x \in S(x_0)$, $S(x)$ is dynamically closed.*

Suppose that the following assumptions are satisfied:

(B1) *$H^{+s} \cap D^+ \neq \emptyset$, or equivalently, $0 \notin \mathrm{cl}(H + D)$.*

(B2) *$\exists\, \xi \in H^{+s} \cap D^+$ such that ξ is lower bounded on $f(S(x_0))$.*

Then, there exists $\hat{x} \in X$ such that

(a) *$f(x_0) \subset f(\hat{x}) + p(x_0, \hat{x})H + D$;*

(b) *$\forall x \in X\backslash\{\hat{x}\}, f(\hat{x}) \not\subset f(x) + p(\hat{x}, x)H + D$.*

If $p(x, x) = 0$ for all $x \in X$, then $\hat{x}$ is a strict minimizer of $f(\cdot) + p(\hat{x}, \cdot)H$. (concerning strict minimizer, see [7, 10])

Proof. Put $F(x, x') = p(x', x)H,\ \forall x, x' \in X$. Clearly, the family $\{F\}$ satisfies property TI. By (B2), there exists $\xi \in H^{+s} \cap D^+$ such that ξ is lower bounded on $f(S(x_0))$. That is, assumption (D) in Theorem 3.1′ is satisfied. Denote $\inf\{\xi(h) : h \in H\}$ by α. Then $\alpha > 0$. We have: $\xi(h) \geq \alpha,\ \forall h \in H$ and $\xi(d) \geq 0,\ \forall d \in D$. Let $x \in S(x_0)$ and let $z_1, z_2 \in S(x)$ with $z_1 \neq z_2$. Then

$$f(x) \subset f(z_i) + p(x, z_i)H + D, \quad i = 1, 2. \tag{4.1}$$

By the definition of r-distances, at least one of $p(x, z_1)$ and $p(x, z_2)$ is strictly greater than 0. For definiteness, we assume that $p(x, z_1) > 0$. From (4.1), we easily see that

$$\inf \xi \circ f(x) \geq \inf \xi \circ f(z_1) + p(x, z_1)\alpha > \inf \xi \circ f(z_1).$$

Hence,

$$\inf\, \xi \circ f(x) > \min\{\inf\, \xi \circ f(z_1), \inf\, \xi \circ f(z_2)\}.$$

That is, assumption (E) in Theorem 3.1′ is satisfied.

Next, we show that assumption (F) in Theorem 3.1′ is satisfied. Let a sequence $(x_n) \subset S(x_0)$ such that $x_n \in S(x_{n-1})$ and

$$\inf\, \xi \circ f(x_n) < \inf\, \xi \circ f(S(x_{n-1})) + \epsilon_n \quad \forall n,$$

where every $\epsilon_n > 0$ and $\epsilon_n \to 0$. For each n, take $y_n \in f(x_n)$ such that

$$\xi \circ y_n < \inf\, \xi \circ f(S(x_{n-1})) + \epsilon_n. \tag{4.2}$$

When $m > n$, $x_m \in S(x_{m-1}) \subset S(x_n)$. Hence,

$$y_n \in f(x_n) \subset f(x_m) + p(x_n, x_m)H + D.$$

Thus, there exists $y_{m,n} \in f(x_m),\ h_{m,n} \in H$ and $d_{m,n} \in D$ such that

$$y_n = y_{m,n} + p(x_n, x_m)h_{m,n} + d_{m,n}.$$

Acting upon two sides of the above equality by ξ, we have

$$\xi \circ y_n = \xi \circ y_{m,n} + p(x_n, x_m)\, \xi \circ h_{m,n} + \xi \circ d_{m,n} \geq \xi \circ y_{m,n} + p(x_n, x_m)\, \alpha. \tag{4.3}$$

Observing that $y_{m,n} \in f(x_m) \subset f(S(x_{n-1}))$ and using (4.3) and (4.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} p(x_n, x_m) &\leq \frac{1}{\alpha}(\xi \circ y_n - \xi \circ y_{m,n}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\alpha}(\xi \circ y_n - \inf \xi \circ f(S(x_{n-1})) \\ &< \frac{1}{\alpha}\epsilon_n. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, $p(x_n, x_m) \to 0 \ \ (m > n \to \infty)$. Since p is an r-distance, (x_n) is a Cauchy sequence in X. And since X is sequentially complete, there exists $u \in X$ such that $x_n \to u$. For each given n, $x_{n+i} \to u$ $(i \to \infty)$, where $(x_{n+i})_{i \in N} \subset S(x_n)$ and $x_{n+i} \in S(x_{n+i-1}),\ \forall i$. Remarking that $S(x_n)$ is dynamically closed, we have $u \in S(x_n)$. Thus, assumption (F) is satisfied. Now, applying Theorem 3.1′ we obtain the result. □

Remark 4.1 In particular, if the sequentially complete uniform space X is a complete metric space (X, d), then we obtain a generalization of [10, Theorem 4.1]. We see that the point k_0 in the ordering cone D and the weak τ-function p appeared in the perturbation in [10, Theorem 4.1] are replaced here by a subset H of the ordering cone D and an r-distance p, respectively. The condition that $k_0 \notin -\mathrm{cl}(D)$ is replaced by (B1), i.e., $0 \notin \mathrm{cl}(H + D)$, or equivalently, $H^{+s} \cap D^+ \neq \emptyset$. And the condition that $f(X)$ is quasi-bounded from below, i.e., there exists a bounded set M such that $f(X) \subset M + D$, is replaced by (B2), i.e., there exists $\xi \in H^{+s} \cap D^+$ such that ξ is lower bounded on $f(S(x_0))$.

Carefully checking the proof of Theorem 4.1, we have the following theorem, which extends [10, Theorem 4.3].

Theorem 4.2. *The result of Theorem 4.1 remains true if the condition that $(X,\mathcal{U})$ is sequentially complete is replaced by one that $(X,\mathcal{U})$ is $S(x_0)$-dynamically complete.*

Traditionally, the statement of EVP, say for a scalar function f on a metric space, includes an $\epsilon > 0$ such that $f(x_0) < \inf\limits_{x\in \mathrm{dom} f} f(x) + \epsilon$ and an estimate of $d(x_0, \hat{x})$. By modifying Theorem 4.2, we can obtain a corresponding statement, which extends [10, Theorem 4.4].

Theorem 4.3. *Let, additionally to the assumptions of Theorem 4.2, that $f(x_0) \not\subset f(x) + \epsilon H + D$ for some $\epsilon > 0$ and all $x \in X$. Then, for any $\lambda > 0$, there exists $\hat{x} \in X$ such that*

(a) $f(x_0) \subset f(\hat{x}) + (\epsilon/\lambda)p(x_0, \hat{x})H + D$;

(b) $\forall x \in X\backslash\{\hat{x}\}$, $f(\hat{x}) \not\subset f(x) + (\epsilon/\lambda)p(\hat{x}, x)H + D$;

(c) $p(x_0, \hat{x}) \leq \lambda$.

Proof. Replacing p by $(\epsilon/\lambda)p$ in the proof of Theorem 4.1, we can obtain $\hat{x} \in X$ such that (a) and (b) are satisfied. We claim that $p(x_0, \hat{x}) \leq \lambda$. Indeed, if $p(x_0, \hat{x}) > \lambda$, then by (a) we would have

$$f(x_0) \subset f(\hat{x}) + \frac{\epsilon}{\lambda} p(x_0, \hat{x})H + D \subset f(\hat{x}) + \epsilon H + D,$$

which contradicts the assumption that $f(x_0) \not\subset f(x) + \epsilon H + D$ for all $x \in X$. □

In order to obtain more special versions of set-valued EVP, we need to recall some concepts. As we know, the lower semi-continuity of scalar functions can be extended to set-valued maps. Let X be a metric space, Y be a locally convex space and $D \subset Y$ be a closed convex cone. As in [7], a set-valued map $f : X \to 2^Y \backslash \{\emptyset\}$ is said to be D-lower semi-continuous (briefly, denoted by D-l.c.s.) on X if for any $y \in Y$, the set $\{x \in X : f(x) \cap (y - D) \neq \emptyset\}$ is closed. In [3, 5, 8, 14], sequentially lower monotone vector-valued maps were considered (in [3], they are called monotonically semicontinuous functions; and in [5], they are called functions satisfying (H4)). We extend the concept to set-valued maps (see [17]). A set-valued map $f : X \to 2^Y \backslash \{\emptyset\}$ is said to be D-sequentially lower monotone (briefly, denoted by D-s.l.m.) if $f(x_n) \subset f(x_{n+1}) + D$, $\forall n$, and $x_n \to \bar{x}$ imply that $f(x_n) \subset f(\bar{x}) + D$, $\forall n$ (in [10], such a set-valued map f is said to be D-lower semi-continuous from above, denoted by D-lsca.). Just as in the case of vector-valued functions, we can show that a D-l.s.c. set-valued map is D-s.l.m., but the converse is not true (see [17]). Here, we discuss problems in a more general setting. Let X be a uniform space and $D \subset Y$ be a convex cone (needn't be closed). In the more general setting, we still define D-s.l.m. set-valued maps as above-mentioned. A set-valued map $f : X \to 2^Y \backslash \{\emptyset\}$ is said to have D-closed (resp., D-locally closed) values if for any $x \in X$, $f(x) + D$ is closed (resp., locally closed). Concerning locally closed sets, see, e.g., [15]. Let H be a nonempty subset of a locally convex space Y. A convex series of points in H is a series of the form $\sum\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_n x_n$, where every $x_n \in H$, $\lambda_n \geq 0$ and $\sum\limits_{n=1}^{\infty} \lambda_n = 1$. H is said to be σ-convex if every convex series of its points converges to a point of H (see [15, Definition 2.1.4]). Sometimes, a σ-convex set is called a cs-complete set, see [22, 23]. It is easy to see that a σ-convex set must be bounded and convex, but it may be non-closed. For example, an open ball in a Banach space is a σ-convex set, but it is not closed. For details, see, e.g., [19] and the references therein.

The following theorem is a generalization of [20, Theorem 4.2], where the perturbation $\gamma d(x, \hat{x})H$ is replaced by a more general version: $p(\hat{x}, x)H$. Hence, it is also a generalization of [22, Theorem 6.2], [18, Theorem 6.8] and [13, Theorem 3.5(ii)].

Theorem 4.4. *Let $(X, \mathcal{U})$ be a uniform space, Y be a locally convex space*

quasi ordered by a convex cone D, $H \subset D\backslash\{0\}$ be a convex set, $f : X \to 2^Y\backslash\{\emptyset\}$ be a set-valued map and $p : X \times X \to [0, +\infty)$ be a p-distance. Let $x_0 \in X$ such that $S(x_0) := \{x \in X : f(x_0) \subset f(x) + p(x_0, x)H + D\} \neq \emptyset$ and $(X,\mathcal{U})$ be $S(x_0)$-dynamically complete. Suppose that the following assumptions are satisfied:

(B1) $H^{+s} \cap D^+ \neq \emptyset$.

(B2) $\exists\, \xi \in H^{+s} \cap D^+$ *such that* ξ *is lower bounded on* $f(S(x_0))$.

(B3) f *is D-s.l.m.*

(B4) H *is* σ*-convex and* f *has D-closed values (or D-locally closed values).*

Then, there exists $\hat{x} \in X$ *such that*

(a) $f(x_0) \subset f(\hat{x}) + p(x_0, \hat{x})H + D$;

(b) $\forall x \in X\backslash\{\hat{x}\}, f(\hat{x}) \not\subset f(x) + p(\hat{x}, x)H + D$.

Proof. Put $F(x, x') = p(x', x)H,\ \forall x, x' \in X$. As in the proof of Theorem 4.1, by (B1) and (B2) we can prove that assumptions (D) and (E) in Theorem 3.1′ are satisfied. It is sufficient to show that assumption (F) in Theorem 3.1′ is satisfied.

Let a sequence $(x_n) \subset S(x_0)$ such that $x_n \in S(x_{n-1})$ and

$$\inf \xi \circ f(x_n) < \inf \xi \circ f(S(x_{n-1})) + \epsilon_n \quad \forall n,$$

where every $\epsilon_n > 0$ and $\epsilon_n \to 0$. As in the proof of Theorem 4.1, we can show that $p(x_n, x_m) \to 0$ $(m > n \to \infty)$. By the definition of p-distances, (x_n) is a Cauchy sequence in $(X,\mathcal{U})$. Since $(X,\mathcal{U})$ is $S(x_0)$-dynamically complete, there exists $u \in X$ such that $x_n \to u$. Again using the definition of p-distances, we have $p(x_n, u) \to 0$ $(n \to \infty)$. Take any fixed $n_0 \in N$ and put $z_1 := x_{n_0}$. As $p(x_k, u) \to 0$ $(k \to \infty)$, we may choose a sequence (z_n) from (x_k) such that $p(z_{n+1}, u) < 1/(n + 1)$ and $z_{n+1} \in S(z_n),\ \forall n$. Take any $v_1 \in f(z_1)$. As $z_2 \in S(z_1)$, we have

$$v_1 \in f(z_1) \subset f(z_2) + p(z_1, z_2)H + D.$$

Hence, there exists $v_2 \in f(z_2),\ h_1 \in H$ and $d_1 \in D$ such that

$$v_1 = v_2 + p(z_1, z_2)h_1 + d_1.$$

In general, if $v_n \in f(z_n)$ is given, then

$$v_n \in f(z_n) \subset f(z_{n+1}) + p(z_n, z_{n+1})H + D.$$

Hence, there exists $v_{n+1} \in f(z_{n+1}),\ h_n \in H$ and $d_n \in D$ such that

$$v_n = v_{n+1} + p(z_n, z_{n+1})h_n + d_n.$$

Adding two sides of the above n equalities, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} v_i \;=\; \sum_{i=2}^{n+1} v_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n} p(z_i, z_{i+1}) h_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i.$$

From this,

$$v_1 \;=\; v_{n+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} p(z_i, z_{i+1}) h_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i. \tag{4.4}$$

As $\xi \in H^{+s} \cap D^+$, $\xi(D) \geq 0$ and there exists $\alpha > 0$ such that $\xi(H) \geq \alpha$. Acting on two sides of (4.4) by ξ, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \xi \circ v_1 &= \xi \circ v_{n+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} p(z_i, z_{i+1})\, \xi(h_i) + \xi\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i\right). \\ &\geq \xi \circ v_{n+1} + \alpha\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} p(z_i, z_{i+1})\right). \end{aligned}$$

From this and using (B2), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i=1}^{n} p(z_i, z_{i+1}) &\leq \frac{1}{\alpha}(\xi \circ v_1 - \xi \circ v_{n+1}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\alpha}(\xi \circ v_1 - \inf \xi \circ f(S(x_0))) \\ &< +\infty. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{\infty} p(z_i, z_{i+1}) < +\infty$. By (B4), H is σ-convex, we conclude that

$$\frac{\sum\limits_{i=1}^{\infty} p(z_i, z_{i+1}) h_i}{\sum\limits_{j=1}^{\infty} p(z_j, z_{j+1})}$$

is convergent to some point $\bar{h} \in H$. Put

$$h'_n := \frac{\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} p(z_i, z_{i+1}) h_i}{\sum\limits_{j=1}^{n} p(z_j, z_{j+1})}.$$

Then every $h'_n \in H$ and $h'_n \to \bar{h}$. Remark that

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} p(z_i, z_{i+1}) \geq p(z_1, u) - p(z_{n+1}, u) > p(z_1, u) - \frac{1}{n+1}.$$

Combining this with (4.4), we have

$$\begin{aligned} v_1 &\in v_{n+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} p(z_i, z_{i+1}) h_i + D \\ &= v_{n+1} + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} p(z_i, z_{i+1}) \right) h'_n + D \\ &\subset v_{n+1} + \left(p(z_1, u) - \frac{1}{n+1} \right) h'_n + D \\ &\subset f(z_{n+1}) + \left(p(z_1, u) - \frac{1}{n+1} \right) h'_n + D. \end{aligned}$$

By (B3), f is D-s.l.m., so $f(z_{n+1}) \subset f(u) + D$. Thus,

$$v_1 \in f(u) + \left(p(z_1, u) - \frac{1}{n+1} \right) h'_n + D. \tag{4.5}$$

Since $(p(z_1, u) - 1/(n+1))h'_n \to p(z_1, u)\bar{h}$ and $f(u) + D$ is closed, by (4.5), we have

$$v_1 \in f(u) + p(z_1, u)\bar{h} + D \subset f(u) + p(z_1, u)H + D.$$

Thus, we have shown that

$$f(z_1) \subset f(u) + p(z_1, u)H + D, \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad u \in S(z_1) = S(x_{n_0}).$$

This means that assumption (F) is satisfied.

If the condition that f has D-closed values is replaced by one that f has D-locally closed values, the result remains true. Since a σ-convex set H is bounded, the sequence (h'_n) in H is indeed locally convergent to $\bar{h}$. Thus, the sequence $\left(\left(p(z_1, u) - \frac{1}{n+1} \right) h'_n \right)_{n \in N}$ is locally convergent to $p(z_1, u)\bar{h}$. From (4.5), we can deduce that $v_1 \in f(u) + p(z_1, u)\bar{h} + D$ as well since $f(u) + D$ is locally closed. □

In Theorem 4.4, if we strengthen the condition that f has D-closed values, then the condition that H is σ-convex may be replaced by a weaker one: H is bounded. Let us introduce a new property on set-valued maps. A set-valued map $f : X \to 2^Y \backslash \{\emptyset\}$ is said to have (D, H)-closed values (or (D, H)-locally closed values) if for any $x \in X$ and any $\lambda \geq 0$, $f(x) + D + \lambda H$ is closed (or locally closed). Now, we can give a variant of Theorem 4.4, which is indeed a generalization of [A pre-order, Theorem 4.2′].

Theorem 4.5. *Let $(X, \mathcal{U})$ be a uniform space, Y be a locally convex space quasi ordered by a convex cone D, $H \subset D \backslash \{0\}$ be a convex set, $f : X \to 2^Y \backslash \{\emptyset\}$*

be a set-valued map and $p : X \times X \to [0, +\infty)$ be a p-distance. Let $x_0 \in X$ such that $S(x_0) := \{x \in X : f(x_0) \subset f(x) + p(x_0, x)H + D\} \neq \emptyset$ and $(X,\mathcal{U})$ be $S(x_0)$-dynamically complete. Suppose that the following assumptions are satisfied:

(B1) *$H^{+s} \cap D^+ \neq \emptyset$.*

(B2) *$\exists\, \xi \in H^{+s} \cap D^+$ such that ξ is lower bounded on $f(S(x_0))$.*

(B3) *f is D-s.l.m.*

(B4′) *H is bounded and f has (D, H)-closed values (or (D, H)-locally closed values).*

Then, there exists $\hat{x} \in X$ such that

(a) $f(x_0) \subset f(\hat{x}) + p(x_0, \hat{x})H + D$;

(b) $\forall x \in X\backslash\{\hat{x}\}, f(\hat{x}) \not\subset f(x) + p(\hat{x}, x)H + D$.

Proof. As we have seen in the proof of Theorem 4.4, we only need to prove that assumption (F) in Theorem 3.1′ is satisfied.

Let a sequence $(x_n) \subset S(x_0)$ such that $x_n \in S(x_{n-1})$ and

$$\inf \xi \circ f(x_n) < \inf \xi \circ f(S(x_{n-1})) + \epsilon_n \quad \forall n,$$

where every $\epsilon_n > 0$ and $\epsilon_n \to 0$. As shown in the proof of Theorem 4.4, there exists $u \in X$ such that $p(x_n, u) \to 0$ $(n \to \infty)$. Take any fixed $n_0 \in N$ and put $z_1 := x_{n_0}$. As $p(x_k, u) \to 0$ $(k \to \infty)$, we may choose a sequence (z_n) from (x_k) such that $p(z_{n+1}, u) < 1/(n + 1)$ and $z_{n+1} \in S(z_n)$, $\forall n$. Take any $v_1 \in f(z_1)$. As done in the proof of Theorem 4.4, we may choose $v_{n+1} \in f(z_{n+1})$, $h_n \in H$ and $d_n \in D$, $\forall n$, such that

$$v_1 \;=\; v_{n+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} p(z_i, z_{i+1})h_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i.$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} v_1 \quad &\in \quad f(z_{n+1}) + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} p(z_i, z_{i+1})\right) H + D \\ &\subset \quad f(z_{n+1}) + \left(p(z_1, u) - p(z_{n+1}, u)\right) H + D \\ &\subset \quad f(z_{n+1}) + \left(p(z_1, u) - \frac{1}{n+1}\right) H + D \\ &\subset \quad f(u) + p(z_1, u)H + D - \frac{1}{n+1}H, \quad \forall n. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for each n, there exists $h_n'' \in H$ such that

$$v_1 + \frac{1}{n+1}h_n'' \in f(u) + p(z_1, u)H + D, \quad \forall n.$$

By (B4′), H is bounded, so $(v_1 + \frac{1}{n+1}h''_n)_{n\in N}$ is (locally) convergent to v_1. Since $f(u) + p(z_1, u)H + D$ is closed (locally closed), we have

$$v_1 \in f(u) + p(z_1, u)H + D.$$

Thus, we have shown that

$$f(z_1) \subset f(u) + p(z_1, u)H + D, \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad u \in S(z_1) = S(x_{n_0}).$$

□

Theorem 4.6. *Let $(X,\mathcal{U})$ be a uniform space, Y be a locally convex space whose topology is generated by a saturated family $\{p_\alpha\}_{\alpha\in\Lambda}$ of semi-norms, $D \subset Y$ be a convex cone, $H \subset D\backslash\{0\}$ be a convex set, $f : X \to 2^Y\backslash\{\emptyset\}$ be a set-valued map and $p : X\times X \to [0, +\infty)$ be a p-distance. Let $x_0 \in X$ such that $S(x_0) \neq \emptyset$ and $(X,\mathcal{U})$ be $S(x_0)$-dynamically complete. Suppose that the following assumptions are satisfied:*

(B1′) *H is closed and for each $\alpha \in \Lambda$, there exists $\xi_\alpha \in D^+\backslash\{0\}$ and $\lambda_\alpha > 0$ such that $\lambda_\alpha p_\alpha(h) \leq \xi_\alpha(h),\ \forall h \in H$.*

(B2′) *$f(S(x_0))$ is quasi-bounded from below, i.e., there exists a bounded set M such that $f(S(x_0)) \subset M + D$.*

(B3) *f is D-s.l.m.*

(B4″) *Y is l^∞-complete* (see [15, 16]) *and f has D-closed values.*

Then, there exists $\hat{x} \in X$ such that

(a) $f(x_0) \subset f(\hat{x}) + p(x_0, \hat{x})H + D$;

(b) $\forall x \in X\backslash\{\hat{x}\}, f(\hat{x}) \not\subset f(x) + p(\hat{x}, x)H + D$.

Proof. Since $0 \notin H$ and H is closed, there exists $\alpha_0 \in \Lambda$ and $\eta > 0$ such that $p_{\alpha_0}(h) \geq \eta,\ \forall h \in H$. By (B1′),

$$\lambda_{\alpha_0}\eta \leq \lambda_{\alpha_0}p_{\alpha_0}(h) \leq \xi_{\alpha_0}(h), \quad \forall h \in H.$$

Thus, $\xi_{\alpha_0} \in D^+ \cap H^{+s}$. By (B2′), ξ_{α_0} is lower bounded on $f(S(x_0))$. As shown in the proof of Theorem 4.1, assumptions (D) and (E) in Theorem 3.1′ are satisfied when putting $\xi = \xi_{\alpha_0}$. Hence, we only need to prove that assumption (F) is satisfied for $\xi = \xi_{\alpha_0}$.

Let a sequence $(x_n) \subset S(x_0)$ such that $x_n \in S(x_{n-1})$ and

$$\inf \xi_{\alpha_0} \circ f(x_n) < \inf \xi_{\alpha_0} \circ f(S(x_{n-1})) + \epsilon_n \quad \forall n,$$

where every $\epsilon_n > 0$ and $\epsilon_n \to 0$. For each n, take $y_n \in f(x_n)$ such that

$$\xi_{\alpha_0} \circ y_n < \inf\, \xi_{\alpha_0} \circ f(S(x_{n-1})) + \epsilon_n. \tag{4.6}$$

When $m > n$, we have $x_m \in S(x_n)$ and hence

$$y_n \in f(x_n) \subset f(x_m) + p(x_n, x_m)H + D.$$

Thus, there exists $y_{m,n} \in f(x_m),\ h_{m,n} \in H$ and $d_{m,n} \in D$ such that

$$y_n = y_{m,n} + p(x_n, x_m)h_{m,n} + d_{m,n}.$$

Acting upon the two sides of the above equality by ξ_{α_0}, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{\alpha_0} \circ y_n &= \xi_{\alpha_0} \circ y_{m,n} + p(x_n, x_m)\, \xi_{\alpha_0} \circ h_{m,n} + \xi_{\alpha_0} \circ d_{m,n} \\ &\geq \xi_{\alpha_0} \circ y_{m,n} + p(x_n, x_m) \cdot \lambda_{\alpha_0} \cdot \eta. \end{aligned}$$

From this and using (4.6), we have

$$\begin{aligned} p(x_n, x_m) &\leq \frac{1}{\lambda_{\alpha_0} \cdot \eta}(\xi_{\alpha_0} \circ y_n - \xi_{\alpha_0} \circ y_{m,n}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\lambda_{\alpha_0} \cdot \eta}(\xi_{\alpha_0} \circ y_n - \inf\, \xi_{\alpha_0} \circ f(S(x_{n-1}))) \\ &< \frac{\epsilon_n}{\lambda_{\alpha_0} \cdot \eta}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, $p(x_n, x_m) \to 0$ $(m > n \to \infty)$ and (x_n) is a Cauchy sequence. As shown in the proof of Theorem 4.4, there exists $u \in X$ such that $p(x_n, u) \to 0$ $(n \to \infty)$. Take any fixed $n_0 \in N$ and put $z_1 := x_{n_0}$. As $p(x_k, u) \to 0 \ \ (k \to \infty)$, we may choose a sequence (z_n) from (x_k) such that $p(z_{n+1}, u) < 1/(n+1)$ and $z_{n+1} \in S(z_n),\ \forall n$. Take any $v_1 \in f(z_1)$. As done in the proof of Theorem 4.4, we may choose $v_{n+1} \in f(z_{n+1}),\ h_n \in H$ and $d_n \in D,\ \forall n$, such that

$$v_1 = v_{n+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} p(z_i, z_{i+1})h_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i. \tag{4.7}$$

For any $\alpha \in \Lambda$,

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_\alpha \circ v_1 &\geq \xi_\alpha \circ v_{n+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} p(z_i, z_{i+1})\, \xi_\alpha \circ h_i \\ &\geq \xi_\alpha \circ v_{n+1} + \lambda_\alpha \sum_{i=1}^{n} p(z_i, z_{i+1}) p_\alpha(h_i). \end{aligned}$$

From this,

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^{n} p(z_i, z_{i+1}) p_\alpha(h_i) &\leq \frac{1}{\lambda_\alpha}(\xi_\alpha \circ v_1 - \xi_\alpha \circ v_{n+1}) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{\lambda_\alpha}(\xi_\alpha \circ v_1 - \inf\, \xi_\alpha \circ f(S(x_0))) \\ &< +\infty, \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

where we use the assumption that $f(S(x_0))$ is quasi-bounded from below. Thus,

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} p(z_i, z_{i+1})\, p_\alpha(h_i) \,<\, +\infty, \quad \forall \alpha \in \Lambda.$$

By (B4″), Y is l^∞-complete, so $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{\infty} p(z_i, z_{i+1}) h_i$ is convergent. On the other hand, putting $\alpha = \alpha_0$ in (4.8),

$$\eta \cdot \sum_{i=1}^{n} p(z_i, z_{i+1}) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{n} p(z_i, z_{i+1}) p_{\alpha_0}(h_i) \leq \frac{1}{\lambda_{\alpha_0}}(\xi_{\alpha_0} \circ v_1 - \inf\, \xi_{\alpha_0} \circ f(S(x_0))) < +\infty.$$

Thus, $\sum\limits_{i=1}^{\infty} p(z_i, z_{i+1}) \,<\, +\infty$. Put

$$\bar{h} := \frac{\sum\limits_{i=1}^{\infty} p(z_i, z_{i+1}) h_i}{\sum\limits_{j=1}^{\infty} p(z_j, z_{j+1})} \quad \text{and} \quad h'_n := \frac{\sum\limits_{i=1}^{n} p(z_i, z_{i+1}) h_i}{\sum\limits_{j=1}^{n} p(z_j, z_{j+1})}.$$

Then, every $h'_n \in H$ and $h'_n \to \bar{h}$. Since H is closed, $\bar{h} \in H$. By (4.7) and (B3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} v_1 &= v_{n+1} + \sum_{i=1}^{n} p(z_i, z_{i+1}) h_i + \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i \\ &= v_{n+1} + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} p(z_i, z_{i+1})\right) h'_n + \sum_{i=1}^{n} d_i \\ &\in f(z_{n+1}) + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} p(z_i, z_{i+1})\right) h'_n + D \\ &\subset f(u) + \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} p(z_i, z_{i+1})\right) h'_n + D \\ &\subset f(u) + (p(z_1, u) - p(z_{n+1}, u)) h'_n + D \\ &\subset f(u) + \left(p(z_1, u) - \frac{1}{n+1}\right) h'_n + D. \end{aligned}$$

Since $(p(z_1, u) - \frac{1}{n+1}) h'_n \to p(z_1, u)\bar{h}$ and $f(u) + D$ is closed, we have

$$v_1 \,\in\, f(u) + p(z_1, u)\bar{h} + D \,\subset\, f(u) + p(z_1, u) H + D.$$

Thus, we have shown that

$$f(z_1) \subset f(u) + p(z_1, u)H + D, \quad \text{i.e.,} \quad u \in S(z_1) = S(x_{n_0}).$$

□

Obviously, Theorem 4.6 generalizes [20, Theorem 4.3]. Hence, it is also a generalization of [13, Theorem 3.5(i)].

We notice that Theorems 4.1 – 4.3 are set-valued EVPs where perturbations contain r-distances and Theorems 4.4 – 4.6 are set-valued EVPs where perturbations contain p-distances. Finally, we consider set-valued EVPs where perturbations contain q-distances. Let us recall the definition of sequential completeness with respect to a q-distance.

Definition 4.4. (see [21]) Let $(X,\mathcal{U})$ be a uniform space and p be a q-distance on X. $(X,\mathcal{U})$ is said to be sequentially complete with respect to p, if for any sequence (x_n) in X with $p(x_n, x_m) \to 0$ $(m > n \to \infty)$, there exists $u \in X$ such that $p(x_n, u) \to 0$ $(n \to \infty)$.

Moreover, we introduce $S(x)$-dynamical completeness with respect to a q-distance.

Definition 4.5. As in Definition 4.3, let $(X,\mathcal{U})$ be a uniform space and p be a q-distance on X. Let $S(\cdot) : X \to 2^X \backslash \{\emptyset\}$ be a set-valued map and $x \in X$. $(X,\mathcal{U})$ is said to be $S(x)$-dynamically complete with respect to p if for any sequence $(x_n) \subset S(x)$ such that $S(x_{n+1}) \subset S(x_n) \subset S(x)$ for all n and such that $p(x_n, x_m) \to 0$ $(m > n \to \infty)$, there exists $u \in X$ such that $p(x_n, u) \to 0$ $(n \to \infty)$.

By checking the proofs of Theorems 4.4 – 4.6 and using Definition 4.5, we can easily obtain the following Theorem 4.7, which indeed includes three theorems corresponding to Theorems 4.4 – 4.6.

Theorem 4.7. *In Theorems 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6, if the assumption that p is a p-distance and $(X,\mathcal{U})$ is $S(x_0)$-dynamically complete is replaced by one that p is a q-distance and $(X,\mathcal{U})$ is $S(x_0)$-dynamically complete with respect to p, then all the results remain true.*

References

[1] T. Q. Bao, B. S. Mordukhovich, Variational principles for set-valued mappings with applications to multiobjective optimization, Control Cybern., 36 (2007), 531-562.

[2] T. Q. Bao, B. S. Mordukhovich, Relative Pareto minimizers for multiobjective problems: existence and optimality conditions, Math. Program, Ser.A, 122 (2010), 301-347.

[3] E. M. Bednarczk, D. Zagrodny, Vector variational principle, Arch. Math. (Basel), 93 (2009), 577-586.

[4] F. Flores-Bazán, C. Gutiérrez, V. Novo, A Brézis-Browder principle on partially ordered spaces and related ordering theorems, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 375 (2011), 245-260.

[5] A. Göpfert, C. Tammer and C. Zălinescu, On the vectorial Ekeland's variational principle and minimal point theorems in product spaces, Nonlinear Anal. 39 (2000), 909-922.

[6] C. Gutiérrez, B. Jiménez, V. Novo, A set-valued Ekeland's variational principle in vector optimization, SIAM J. Control. Optim., 47 (2008), 883-903.

[7] T. X. D. Ha, Some variants of the Ekeland variational principle for a set-valued map, J. Optim. Theory Appl., 124 (2005), 187-206.

[8] A. H. Hamel, Equivalents to Ekeland's variational principle in uniform spaces, Nonlinear Anal. 62 (2005), 913-924.

[9] O. Kada, T. Suzuki, W. Takahashi, Nonconvex minimization theorems and fixed point theorems in complete metric spaces, Math. Japon., 44 (1996), 381-391.

[10] P. Q. Khanh, D. N. Quy, On generalized Ekeland's variational principle and equivalent formulations for set-valued mappings, J. Glob. Optim., 49 (2011), 381-396.

[11] P. Q. Khanh, D. N. Quy, Versions of Ekeland's variational principle involving set perturbations, J. Glob. Optim., 57 (2013), 951-968.

[12] L. J. Lin, W. S. Du, Ekeland's variational principle, minimax theorems and existence of nonconvex equilibria in complete metric spaces, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 323 (2006), 360-370.

[13] C. G. Liu, K. F. Ng, Ekeland's variational principle for set-valued functions, SIAM J. Optim., 21 (2011), 41-56.

[14] A. B. Németh, A nonconvex vector minimization problem, Nonlinear Anal. 10 (1986), 669-678.

[15] P. Pérez Carreras, J. Bonet, Barrelled Locally Convex Spaces, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1987.

[16] J. H. Qiu, Local completeness and dual local quasi-completeness, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 129 (2001) 1419-1425.

[17] J. H. Qiu, On Ha's version of set-valued Ekeland's variational principle, Acta Math. Sinica, English Series, 28 (2012), 717-726.

[18] J. H. Qiu, Set-valued quasi-metrics and a general Ekeland's variational principle in vector optimization, SIAM J. Control Optim., 51 (2013), 1350-1371.

[19] J. H. Qiu, The domination property for efficiency and Bishop-Phelps theorem in locally convex spaces, J. Math. Anal. Appl., 402 (2013), 133-146.

[20] J. H. Qiu, A pre-order principle and set-valued Ekeland variational principle, arXiv: 1311.4951[math.FA].

[21] J. H. Qiu, F. He, p-distances, q-distances and a generalized Ekeland's variational principle in uniform spaces, Acta Math. Sinica, English Ser., 28 (2012), 235-254.

[22] C. Tammer, C. Zălinescu, Vector variational principle for set-valued functions, Optimization, 60 (2011), 839-857.

[23] C. Zălinescu, Convex Analysis in General Vector Spaces, World Sci., Singapore, 2002.